# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

| JENNIFER JAUNDER   | CV 07 2725<br>FEUERSTEIN, J.  |
|--|---|
| NAME OF PLAINTIFF(S)  NAME OF PLAINTIFF(S)  DEPT. OF MANUAL STATES | RECEIVED  |
| NAME OF DEFENDANT(S)   | PRO SE OFFICE   |
| that apply):   | nation in employment pursuant to (check only those the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as codified, 42 U.S.C. |

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as codified, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (amended in 1972, 1978 and by the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-166) (race, color, gender, religion, national origin).

NOTE: In order to bring a suit in federal district court under Title VII, you must first obtain a right to sue letter from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as codified, 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 - 634 (amended in 1984, 1990, and by the Age Discrimination in Employment Amendments of 1986, Pub. L. No. 92-592, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-166). NOTE: In order to bring a suit in federal district court under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, you must first file charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as codified, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12112 - 12117 (amended by the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-166).

NOTE: In order to bring suit in federal district court under the Americans with Disabilities Act, you must first obtain a right to sue letter from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Jurisdiction is specifically conferred upon this United States District Court by the aformentioned statutes, as well as 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343. Jurisdiction may also be appropriate under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1983 and 1985(3), as amended by the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-166, and any related claims under New York law.

| 1. | Plaintiff resid | les at:                   |                                     |   |
|----|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| _/ | 75 PROS         | PECT ST. AF               | PT. 23E EN                          | T DRANGE                                  |
|    | ,               | Street Address            |                                     | ,   |
|    | ESSEX           | _, _ <i>N</i> V,          | 07617                               | <u>[913]678-288/.</u><br>Telephone Number |
|    | County          | State                     | Zip Code                            | Telephone Number                          |
| 2. | _               | resides at, or its busine | ess is located at:                  |   |
|    | 65 LOUK         | r St.                     |                                     |   |
|    |                 | Street Address            |                                     |   |
| _/ | County,         | BROOK 1411<br>City        | State                               | ,   |
| 3. | The address     |                           | oyment or was employ<br>- AJ- ABOYE | ed by the defendant(s) is:                |
|    | .,              | Street Address            |                                     |   |
|    |                 |                           |                                     |   |
|    | County          | City                      | State                               | Zip Code                                  |

| 4. |         | iscriminatory conductionly those that appl                                |                    | plain in this  | action includes                  |    |
|----|---------|---|--------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|----|
|    |         |   | Failure to hir     | e.             |                                  |    |
|    |         |   | Termination        | of my emplo    | yment.                           |    |
|    |         |   | Failure to pro     | omote.         |                                  |    |
|    |         | —,  | Failure to acc     | commodate r    | ny disability.                   |    |
|    |         |   | Unequal tern       | ns and condi   | tions of my employment.          |    |
|    |         |   | Retaliation        |                |                                  |    |
|    |         |   | Other acts (s      | pecify):       |                                  |    |
|    | -       | those grounds raised<br>can be considered by                              |                    |                | Equal Employment Opportuni       | ty |
| 5. | It is n | ny best recollection (  | hat the alleged d  | iscriminatory  | acts occurred on:                |    |
|    | Date(   |   | /-/-               |                |                                  |    |
| 6. | I beli  | eve that the defendar   | nt(s) (check one)  |                |                                  |    |
|    |         | is still com  | mitting these act  | s against me   |                                  |    |
|    |         | is <u>not</u> still o   | committing these   | acts against   | me.                              |    |
| 7. | (chec   | ndant(s) discriminate<br>k only those that app<br>is your religion, if re | iy and state the b | oasis for disc | rimination, for example,<br>ged) |    |
|    | M       | гасе  | []                 | color          |                                  |    |
|    | M       | gender/sex  | []                 | religion_      |                                  |    |
|    | []      | national origin   |                    |                |                                  |    |
|    | M       | age   | My date of b       | oirth is:      |                                  |    |
|    | []      | disability  |                    |                | Date                             |    |

NOTE: Only those grounds raised in the charge filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission can be considered by the federal district court.

| 8.    | The facts of my case are as follows:  |
|-------|---|
|       | SEE ATTACHED LETTERI  |
|       |   |
|       |   |
|       |   |
|       |   |
|       |   |
|       |   |
|       |   |
|       |   |
|       | <u> </u>  |
|       |   |
|       |   |
|       | (Attach additional sheets as necessary)   |
|       |   |
| Note: | As additional support for your claim, you may attach to this complaint a copy of the charge filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the New York State Division of Human Rights, or the New York City Commission on Human Rights. |
| 9.    | It is my best recollection that I filed a charge with the New York State Division of Human  |
|       | Rights or the New York City Commission on Human Rights regarding defendant's  |
|       | alleged discriminatory conduct on: 3.12.05 Date   |
| 10.   | It is my best recollection that I filed a charge with the Equal Employment Opportunity  |
|       | Commission regarding defendant's alleged discriminatory conduct on:   |
|       | Date  |

## Only litigants alleging age discrimination must answer Question #11.

| 11.   | Since filing my charge of age discr                                     | imination with the Equal Employment Opportunity                                     |
|-------|---|---|
|       | Commission regarding defendant's  | s alleged discriminatory conduct (check one),                                       |
|       |   | 60 days or more have elapsed.   |
|       |   | less than 60 days have elapsed.   |
| 12.   | The Equal Employment Opportuni  | ity Commission (check one):   |
|       | <del>/-</del>   | has not issued a Right to Sue letter.   |
|       |   | has issued a Right to Sue letter, which I received on  Date                         |
|       |   | Date  |
| NOT   | E: Attach a copy of the Right<br>Commission to this compla              | to Sue Letter from the Equal Employment Opportunity aint.                           |
| inclu | WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays tha<br>ding injunctive orders, damages, cost | t the Court grant such relief as may be appropriate, is, and attorney's fees.       |
| Dated | 1: 1/03/07  | PHAINTIFY'S SIGNATURE   |
|       |   | 175 Prospect At, #23E  Address  East Drange, XG 07017  [973] 678.2881  Phone Number |

EEOC Form 161 (3/98)

## DISMISSAL AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS

To: Jennifer Saunders 175 Prospect Street, #23E East Orange, NJ 07017

From: **New York District Office** 33 Whitehall Street 5th Floor New York, NY 10004

| EAC Charge No.  | DENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(a)) EEOC Representative   | Telephone No.   |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| EOC Charge No   | Holly M. Woodyard,  | roophalo no.  |  |  |  |
| 6G-2005-02168   | Investigator  | (212) 336-3643  |  |  |  |
|   | TS FILE ON THIS CHARGE FOR THE FOLLOWING  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   |  |  |  |
|   | n the charge fail to state a claim under any of the statutes enforced   |   |  |  |  |
| Your allegations di                                   | d not involve a disability as defined by the Americans With Disabil   | lities Act.   |  |  |  |
| The Respondent e                                      | ruplays less than the required number of employees or is not other  | rwise covered by the statutes.  |  |  |  |
| Your charge was n                                     | not timely filed with EEOC; in other words, you walted too long aft   | er the date(s) of the alleged discrimination to file your                                     |  |  |  |
| Having been given interviews/conference               | en 30 days in which to respond, you failed to provide inces, or otherwise failed to cooperate to the extent that it was not p   | Information, falled to appear or be available for possible to resolve your charge.            |  |  |  |
| While reasonable                                      | efforts were made to locate you, we were not able to do so.   |   |  |  |  |
| You were given 30                                     | days to accept a reasonable settlement offer that affords full relief   | f for the harm you alleged.   |  |  |  |
| establishes violation                                 | The EEOC issues the following determination: Based upon its investigation, the EEOC is unable to conclude that the information obtained establishes violations of the statutes. This does not certify that the respondent is in compliance with the statutes. No finding is made as to any other issues that might be construed as having been relied by this charge. |   |  |  |  |
| X The EEOC has ad                                     | opted the findings of the state or local fair employment practices as   | gency that investigated this charge.  |  |  |  |
| Other (briefly state                                  | y   |   |  |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>NOTICE OF SUIT RIGHTS -</li> <li>(See the additional information attached to this formation)</li> </ul>  | nm.)  |  |  |  |
| otice of dismissal and of yederal law based on this o | rith Disabilities Act, and/or the Age Discrimination your right to sue that we will send you. You may file tharge in federal or state court. Your lawsuit must at to sue based on this charge will be lost. (The time I   | e a lawsuit against the respondent(s) under<br>be filed <u>WITHIN 90 DAYS</u> of your receipt |  |  |  |
|   | A suits must be filed in federal or state court within This means that backers the for any violations of be collectible.  |   |  |  |  |
|   | of the second   |   |  |  |  |
| Endosures(s)  | Spencer H, Lewis, Jr.,  | 4/2/07 (Date Mailed)  |  |  |  |

52 Chambers Street, Room 308 New York, NY 10007

Attn: Human Resource Director

EEOC Porm 161 (3/98)

## DISMISSAL AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS

| 175 Pr  | er Saunder<br>rospect Str<br>Frange, NJ | eet, #23E   |   | From:  | New York District Office<br>33 Whitehall Street<br>5th Floor<br>New York, NY 10004 | floor  |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
|   | -                                       | CONFIDENTIAL (29 C  |   |  | (212) 336  | 3620   |
| EEOC Charge   | a No.                                   |   | QC Representative   |  | 8:30-4:00  | Telephone No.  |
| 16G-2005-   | 02404                                   |   | olly M. Woodyard,<br>vestigator                                     |  | M-F  | (212) 336-3643   |
|   |   | l <u> </u>  | <u> </u>  | · FOLLO  | L L  | (212) 330-3043   |
| THE EEOC  |   |   | THIS CHARGE FOR THE<br>to state a claim under any of the            |  |  |  |
|   | Your allega                             | tions did not involve a d   | lisability as defined by the Amer                                   | riçanş Witt  | Disabilities Act   |  |
|   | The Respo                               | ndent employs less that   | n the required number of employ                                     | ees or is r  | ot otherwise covered by the s  | talutes.   |
|   |   |   |   |  |  | lleged discrimination to file your                           |
|   | Having be                               | en given 30 days in<br>conferences, or otherwis                           | n which to respond, you fails<br>se failed to cooperate to the exte | iled to pr<br>ent that it v  | ovide Information, failed to<br>as not possible to resolve you                     | appear or be available for ir charge.                        |
|   | While reas                              | onable efforts were mad   | le to locate you, we were not ab                                    | le to do so  |  | • •  |
|   | You were g                              | given 30 days to accept   | a reasonable settlement offer th                                    | at affords   | full relief for the harm you alleg   | jed.   |
| The EEOC issues the following determination: Based upon its investigation, the EEOC is unable to conclude that the information obtained establishes violations of the statutes. This does not certify that the respondent is in compliance with the statutes. No finding is made as to any other issues that might be construed as having been raised by this charge.   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| X   | The EEOC                                | has adopted the finding   | gs of the state or local fair emplo                                 | yment pra  | ctices agency that investigated  | this charge.   |
|   | Other (brie                             | fly state)  |   |  |  |  |
|   |   |   | - NOTICE OF SUI   |  |  |  |
| Title VII, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and/or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act: This will be the only notice of dismissal and of your right to sue that we will send you. You may file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) under federal law based on this charge in federal or state court. Your lawsuit must be filed <u>WITHIN 90 DAYS</u> of your receipt of this notice; or your right to sue based on this charge will be lost. (The time limit for filling suit based on a state claim may be different.) |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| alleged EP.   | A underpa                               |   | s that backpay due for a<br>ible.                                   | ny viola<br>f the Con  | tions that occurred mo   | for willful violations) of the<br>ore than 2 years (3 years) |
| <b>= .</b>  |   | •   |   | The state of the s |  | 4/2/07   |
| Enclosures(s  | 5)                                      |   | Spencer H. L.<br>Direct   |  | 0  | (Date Mailed)  |
| 52<br>No  | Chambers<br>w York, N                   | York Dept. of Educa<br>s Street, Room 308<br>Y 10007<br>Resource Director | 1-800   | Ani  | WWW  | . EEOC. GOV  |
|   |   |   | 009   | 711  | 19 ´   |  |

STATE OF NEW YORK DIVISION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

STATE DIVISION OF HUMAN RIGHTS on the Complaint of

JENNIFER SAUNDERS

Complainant

ν.

NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION Respondent

DETERMINATION AND ORDER AFTER INVESTIGATION

Case No. 10104311

Federal Charge No. 16GA502168

On March 2, 2005, Jennifer Saunders filed a Verified Complaint with the State Division of Human Rights (the "Division") charging the above-named Respondent with an unlawful discriminatory practice relating to employment because of age, race/color, and sex in violation of the Human Rights Law of the State of New York.

After investigation, and following an opportunity for review of related information and evidence by the named parties, the Division has determined that there is NO PROBABLE CAUSE to believe that Respondent has engaged in or is engaging in the alleged unlawful discriminatory practice. This determination is based on the following:

The evidence gathered during the investigation does not support Complainant's allegations of discrimination based on age, race/color and sex. The Division notes for the record that its phone calls to Complainant's witnesses were not returned.

With regard to Complainant's allegation that she was discriminated against because she is forty-six (46) years of age, the Division notes that Complainant, a Black Teacher, did not initially plead a prima facie case by failing to note an occurrence that she construed as discriminatory based on her age. Complainant subsequently failed to offer the Division evidence concerning Respondent's conduct with regard to age discrimination or offer evidence that she reported such conduct to Respondent seeking redress during her employ. Based on these facts, the Division cannot find a violation of the New York State Human Rights Law with regard to age discrimination.

With regard to Complainant's allegation of race

#### Case 1:07-cv-02725-SJF -LB Document 1 Filed 07/03/07 Page 9 of 12

Determination: Dismissal No Probable Cause

SDHR Case No. 10104311

Jennifer Saunders V. New York City Department Of Education

discrimination, the Division's investigation did not reveal sufficient evidence to support this allegation. The record does not support the allegation that Respondent's treatment, specifically School Principal Resnick's treatment of the Complainant's employment, was due to Complainant being Black. Aside from grievances related to alleged violations of the collective bargaining agreement, and accusations to the police and to the school that Principal Resnick assaulted her at school, the record indicates that Complainant did not seek redress from Respondent with regard to discrimination based on race.

With regard to Complainant's allegation that Respondent discriminated against her because she is a female, the Division notes that Complainant did not initially plead a prima facie case. Through the Division's investigation, Complainant additionally did not allege an act perpetrated by Principal Resnick, a male, which Complainant construed as discriminatory based on her sex. Further, the investigation did not reveal evidence demonstrating that Complainant was in fact treated differently or in a derogatory manner in the workplace because she is female. The Division notes that the majority of teachers employed at Principal Resnick's school are female.

The investigation reveals that Respondent's actions toward Complainant were based on its concerns about Complainant's poor time and attendance. The record shows that by March 2004, during the school year 2003-2004, Complainant had already been absent eight (8) times and late fifteen (15) times (for a total of over four hundred seventy-four (474) times). By the end of the 2003-2004 academic year, Complainant had been late a total of eighteen (18) times. Further, during the 2004-2005 school year, the record indicates that Complainant was absent from work eleven (11) times and late for work eleven (11) times. During the 2004-2005 school year, Complainant was also cited for failing to meet with Principal Resnick with regard to her poor attendance.

Additionally, the investigation reveals that Respondent conducted several observations of Complainant's classroom and concluded that her manner was unbecoming a professional educator, which was noted on three (3) dates: November 24, 2004, February 4, 2005 and February 15, 2005. On the noted dates, Complainant was observed reading a newspaper in the classroom during instructional time; her students were observed engaged in non-school related activities such as reading a newspaper;

Determination: Dismissal No Probable Cause

SDHR Case No. 10104311

Jennifer Saunders V. New York City Department Of Education

students were listening to music during instructional time; students were loitering; and students were conversing with peers and playing cards during instructional time.

The investigation further reveals that on February 15, 2005, during an economics class, Complainant was observed beginning the lesson by stating to the class, words to the effect: fifty years ago black people rose up. Complainant then proceeded to sing a song in front of the class that noted words to the effect: one thing we did right was when we stood up to fight, keep your eyes on the prize. The Division notes that Complainant inappropriately used an economics class as a forum to express her personal views. Consequently, Complainant was subjected to disciplinary action for conduct noted in the record as follows: neglect of duty; conduct unbecoming Complainant's position or conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency or discipline of the service; substantial cause rendering complainant unfit to properly perform her obligations of service.

The Division notes that Complainant's rebuttal is replete with her concerns about Jerod Resnick, the school's Principal, and his treatment of teachers, which includes herself, staff and students and the lack of strong union leadership at the school. The record also shows that Complainant filed a police report alleging that she was assaulted by Mr. Resnick on October 22, 2004.

The investigation reveals that on February 23, 2005, Complainant complained to Respondent's School Safety Division, that Mr. Resnick shoved her on October 22, 2004. Respondent investigated the alleged assault. The record shows that Complainant specifically alleged "she was physically shoved by Principal Resnick in the hallway at 11:30 a.m. on October 22, 2004".

Santiago Respondent's Taveras, Local Superintendent, investigated Complainant's alleged assault and found that at the time of the assault, Complainant was teaching a class scheduled to begin at 11:30 a.m., but had begun at 11:22 a.m. and ended at 12:07 p.m. The noted time conflicts made it implausible that the incident between Complainant and Principal Resnick occurred as noted by Complainant. Mr. Taveras concluded that Complainant's report was false, and referred the matter to Respondent's Office Special Investigation. Mr. Taveras also informed Complainant, in a letter dated March 11, 2005, that her

Determination: Dismissal No Probable Cause

SDHR Case No. 10104311

Jennifer Saunders V. New York City Department Of Education

accusation was deemed false and was a basis for her removal from the school and assignment at another location. Respondent filed specification charges against Complainant seeking her termination as a result of Complainant's failure to improve her tardiness and absences, her continued neglect with regard to her duties, and her false accusation against Principal Resnick. Charges against Complainant are pending.

Based on the noted facts, the Division cannot find a violation of the New York State Human Rights. Therefore, the Verified Complaint is ordered dismissed and the file is closed.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that any party to this proceeding may appeal this Determination to the New York State Supreme Court in the County wherein the alleged unlawful discriminatory practice took place by filing directly with such court a Notice of Petition and Petition within sixty (60) days after service of this Determination. A copy of this Notice and Petition must also be served on all parties including General Counsel, State Division of Human Rights, One Fordham Plaza, 4th Floor, Bronx, New York 10458. DO NOT FILE THE ORIGINAL NOTICE AND PETITION WITH THE STATE DIVISION OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that a complainant who seeks state judicial review and who receives an adverse decision therein, may lose his or her right to proceed subsequently in federal court by virtue of <a href="Kremer v. Chemical Construction Co.">Kremer v. Chemical Construction Co.</a>, 456 U.S. 461 (1982).

Your charge was also filed under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Your charge was also filed under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA). Enforcement of the aforementioned law(s) is the responsibility of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). You have the right to request a review by EEOC of this action. To secure review, you must request it in writing, within fifteen (15) days of your receipt of this letter, by writing to EEOC, New York District Office, 33 Whitehall Street, 5th Floor, New York, New York 10004-2112. Otherwise, EEOC will generally adopt our action in your case.

Determination: Dismissal No Probable Cause

SDHR Case No. 10104311

Jennifer Saunders V. New York City Department Of Education

Dated: January 30, 2007

Brooklyn, New York

STATE DIVISION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

By:

William LaMot

Regional Director